

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
DRAFT

DATE: Wednesday, May 19, 2021  
TIME: 6:00 PM  
PLACE: REMOTE ATTENDANCE VIA ZOOM MEETING VIDEO

PRESENT:

Bolton:	Sharon Murray	Buel's Gore:	Garret Mott
Burlington:	Andy Montroll	Charlotte:	Jim Donovan
Colchester:	Pam Loranger (Alternate)	Essex:	Jeff Carr (Alternate)
Essex Junction:	Jeff Carr (2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternate)	Hinesburg:	Absent
Huntington:	Barbara Elliott	Jericho:	Catherine McMains
Jericho:	Wayne Howe (Alternate)	Milton:	Tony Micklus
Richmond:	Bard Hill	St. George:	Absent
Shelburne:	John Zicconi	So. Burlington:	Chris Shaw
Underhill:	Kurt Johnson	Westford:	Absent
Williston:	Erik Wells	Winooski:	Michael O'Brien
Cons/Env.:	Absent	VTrans:	Matthew Langham
Bus/Ind:	Absent	GMT:	Absent
Agriculture:	Absent	Socio/Econ/Housing:	Justin Dextrateur

Others:

Shana Loiselle, VELCO	Hantz Presume, VELCO
Lou Cecere, VELCO	Marc Allen, VELCO
Graham Turk, GMP	Kevin Harms, CCTV

Absent: Amy Bell, VTRANS

Staff:

Charlie Baker, Executive Director	Regina Mahony, Planning Prgm Mgr.
Eleni Churchill, Trans. Prgm Mgr.	Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Mgr.
Taylor Newton, Senior Trans. Planner	Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planer
Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr.	Melanie Needle, Senior Planner

1. Call to order; Attendance; Changes to the Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 PM by the Chair, Michael O'Brien. Mike stated there was one change to the agenda: move item 6, FY22 UPWP and Budget up to item 5. Jeff Carr noted he was representing both towns Essex and Essex Junction.

2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda. There were none.

3. Action on Consent Agenda, MPO Business.

The consent agenda included the following requested FY21 TIP Amendments:

- I-89 Culvert, Colchester; Project BR065, Amendment FY21-24. Add \$205,245 in federal funds to rehabilitate a culvert on I-89.
- Airport Drive Infiltration Project, South Burlington; Project OT048, Amendment FY21-25. Add a new Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation program award for a stormwater infiltration project in South Burlington. Add \$60,000 for preliminary engineering in FY21, \$8,000 for right-of-way in FY22, and \$320,000 for construction in FY23.

- 1 • VT2A Connector Path, Beaudry Lane to VSECU, Williston; Project BP112, Amendment FY21-26.  
2 Add a new Transportation Alternatives award for a connector path along VT2A in Williston. Add  
3 \$46,512 for preliminary engineering in FY21.
- 4 • Spear Street Bike/Ped Connector, US Forest Service to Swift Street, South Burlington; Project  
5 BP113, Amendment FY21-27. Add a new Transportation Alternatives award for a connector path  
6 along Spear Street in South Burlington. Add \$53,904 for preliminary engineering in FY21.
- 7 • Exit 16 Improvements, Colchester; Project HP102, Amendment FY21-28. Remove \$4,794,000 in  
8 federal funds for construction in FY21 and add \$1,250,000 for preliminary engineering in FY21.  
9 The current project schedule does not anticipate that construction funds will be needed in FY21  
10 (before September 30, 2021). Additional preliminary engineering funds are needed.
- 11 • Class I Concrete Pavement Repair, US7 and West Allen Street, Winooski; Project HP145,  
12 Amendment FY21-29. The low bid for this project was \$1,297,953 and the project cost in the TIP  
13 is \$1,150,000 which is a 13% increase in project cost. Add \$222,362 in federal funds in FY22 for  
14 this project.
- 15 • Exit 17 Improvements, Colchester; Project BR050, Amendment FY21-30. Advance \$600,000 in  
16 right-of-way funds from FY20 to FY21. The FY20 TIP had \$800,000 for right-of-way but only  
17 obligated \$100,000. An additional \$600,000 is needed.

18  
19 JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT  
20 AGENDA ITEMS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY MPO MEMBERS.

- 21  
22 4. Approve Minutes of the April 21, 2021 Board Meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY  
23 CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 21, 2021 BOARD MEETING MINUTES, WITH EDIT(S).  
24 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 25  
26 • Edit: Page 3, Line 35, remove parentheses and add the word “are” to the following sentence:  
27 “DC Fast Charging stations are public charge stations”.

28  
29 5. FY22 UPWP and Budget

- 30 a. Public Hearing. CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO OPEN THE  
31 PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:06 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
32

33 6. Draft VELCO Long Range Transmission Plan presentation

34 Regina introduced Vermont Electric Power Company (VELCO) staff members, Shana Loiselle,  
35 Communications & Policy Advocate, and Hantz Presume, Senior Lead Planner. VELCO Staff were  
36 invited to provide an overview presentation on the VELCO Draft Long Range Transmission plan.  
37 Additionally, Lou Cecere and Marc Allen, Transmission Planning Engineers with VELCO, and Graham  
38 Turk, Innovation Strategist, from Green Mountain Power (GMP) were in attendance. Regina  
39 reminded members this is an informational overview only and no action is required. The  
40 information will ultimately be incorporated into the next ECOS and Energy Plan update.  
41

42 The Draft VELCO Long Range Transmission Plan represents a future 20-year projection and includes  
43 findings of 18-22 months collaboration between multiple stakeholders. Input has been collected  
44 from the public, state regulators and RPCs. Shana shared a short video. Highlights of the video  
45 included the following: VELCO manages the state-wide electric transmission system. Every three  
46 years VELCO must publish an update of its 20-year Vermont Long-Range Transmission Plan. The plan  
47 identifies reliability concerns and the transmission alternatives that will address those concerns.  
48

1 Hantz Presume shared the PowerPoint presentation, Draft 2021 Vermont Long-Range Transmission  
2 Plan with members. The plan was prepared to:

- 3 • Plan associated public outreach required by Vermont statute and Public Utility  
4 Commission order
- 5 • Support full, fair, timely consideration of all cost-effective non-wires solutions to  
6 growth-related issues
- 7 • Inform utilities, regulators, and other stakeholders' consideration of policy and projects  
8

9 Information provided within the presentation included:

- 10 • Load Forecast Scenarios; winter and summer, spanning years 2020-2040
- 11 • Solar PV Growth Scenarios; Economic forecast spanning years 2020-2040
- 12 • Results of Ability to Serve Peak Loads = No major upgrades needed to serve load within the  
13 10-year horizon
  - 14 ○ Bulk System: No peak load concerns
  - 15 ○ Predominately Bulk System: No peak load concerns/Acceptable loss of load, as a  
16 direct consequence of outage and operator actions
  - 17 ○ Sub-transmission issues: Some issues/concerns
  - 18 ○ High Load scenario: Minimal effect within 10 years. After 10 years requires non-  
19 transmission solutions to avoid transmission upgrades, load management, energy  
20 efficiency, storage, and generation
- 21 • Results: Ability to Accommodate Distributed Generation (DG)
  - 22 ○ Optimizing DG distribution avoids major upgrades in short term
  - 23 ○ Increased solar generation exceeds what Vermont's transmission system may be  
24 able can accommodate in 10 years
- 25 • Solar PV Map - Transmission total DG zone limits
  - 26 ○ Transmission system capacity is greater in the southern part of Vermont than in the  
27 north
- 28 • Optimized solar PV distribution Regional Planning Commission Zones
  - 29 ○ VELCO compared optimized solar PV scenario to RPC solar generation targets in RPC  
30 Regional Energy Plans – in most cases, optimized solar PV scenario capacity is less  
31 than the RPC solar generation targets. This demonstrates areas of concern where  
32 we need to find ways to meet the targets. We must find ways to absorb the excess  
33 generation in areas and accommodate load flexibility
- 34 • Recommendations
  - 35 ○ Greater weight to grid impacts when needed when siting generation
  - 36 ○ Bring to scale flexible load management
    - 37 ■ Enable inverter grid support functionality (voltage control and ride through  
38 capability)
    - 39 ■ Enable utility management of distributed generation
    - 40 ■ Continue to evolve with storage
    - 41 ■ Establish data organizational architecture
    - 42 ■ Deepen/Broaden fiber communications network
  - 43 ○ Grid Reinforcements
    - 44 ■ Transmission
    - 45 ■ Sub transmission
    - 46 ■ Distribution investments
- 47 • Next Outreach Steps

- 1           ○ Continue direct, key stakeholder discussions
- 2           ○ Incorporate public comments into report
- 3           ○ Submit report to Vermont Public Utility Commission by July 1, 2021

4  
5       Garret Mott asked about storage options. Hantz said there are various options available, examples  
6 include battery storage, compressed air, and pump-hydro. Flow batteries for long range storage.

7  
8       Jeff Carr had two questions. First, for the long term, is there a potential disruption effect associated  
9 with Global Foundries? Hantz said this has more to do with supply generation and from a  
10 transmission perspective there is no change. He is not aware of any needs for upgrades due to  
11 Global Foundries plans. Global Foundries would have access to power from New England and they  
12 are not planning to increase the MW's they need. Second, there was a lot of time spent working on  
13 a transmission proposal with Canada, where Hydro-Quebec would bring electric transmission to  
14 New England. This would help with funding capabilities. Is this over or is it still something that  
15 could still happen? Hantz explained there is still possibility for Canadian import to work with New  
16 England states within the next 5 to 10 years.

17  
18       Bard Hill asked what is attention to siting and what does this look like for planning commissions?  
19 Hantz explained what we are seeing in terms of siting, where part of the system generation is being  
20 curtailed and large 500KW projects affect the system negatively. In areas where there is a lot of  
21 activity feeders are at capacity. There are potential mitigating measures to have developers look at  
22 other storage options. Bard also questioned the aggressive targets for Electric Vehicles. Hantz  
23 stated, this is what we want in Vermont; Electric Vehicles, Heat Pumps, there will be much more of  
24 this in the future. The forecast predicts large loads, and the system is not designed to hold these. It  
25 does not mean we shouldn't do this; it simply means we need to think of ways to make it happen.  
26 Essentially, we need to do more to accommodate the forecasts.

27  
28       Sharon Murray asked if wind energy is off the table for long range planning? Hantz said, "no," it is an  
29 option, but Vermont has not seen a lot of interest to build large scale wind plants.

30  
31       John Zicconi asked if transmission upgrades are funded by project developers? Hantz explained yes,  
32 the beneficiary pays. Vermont is part of an interconnected New England grid. Capacity and energy  
33 resources and the costs associated are shared. Graham explained there is a tariff system associated  
34 with solar scale and storage on the GMP system. We want to send a message to larger developers  
35 that they need to be in places with capacity. John also asked about the future of Electric Vehicles  
36 and Green Mountain Power storage. Hantz said this is real, the technology is there but it is about  
37 customer choice. The schedule for at home Electric Vehicle charging stations being switched off is  
38 voluntary scheduling. Graham explained GMP is using it as a fleet vehicle system now. We are still  
39 waiting for technology to mature and it is not available as residential model.

40  
41       Regina, Mike, and Charlie thanked everyone from VELCO and Graham from GMP for sharing the  
42 information with us. Shana shared VELCO's long range transmission plan, found here:

43       [Vermont Long-Range Transmission Plan \(vermontspc.com\)](http://vermontspc.com)

44  
45       5. FY22 UPWP and Budget (continued)

46       Mike invited members to return to agenda item 5 and asked if there were any members of the public  
47 in attendance. There were none.

48

1 b. Public Hearing. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO CLOSE THE  
 2 PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:58 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3  
 4 Charlie referred members to the FY22 UPWP and Budget documents included with the packet. He  
 5 explained there was one edit to task 7.1.3 Vermont Online Bridge and Inventory Tool. VTrans is  
 6 increasing the budget amount to \$25,000. Charlie explained some of the projects remain in a  
 7 pending status because they are legislatively driven, and he is confident these will be finalized soon.

8  
 9 Approve FY22 UPWP & BUDGET

10 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE FY22 UPWP AND  
 11 BUDGET AS PRESENTED. VOTE:

12 Bolton:	Yes	Burlington:	Yes (4)	Charlotte:	Yes
13 Colchester:	Yes (2)	Essex:	Yes	Essex Jct:	Yes
14 Hinesburg:	Absent	Huntington:	Yes	Jericho:	Yes
15 Milton:	Yes	Richmond:	Yes	St. George:	Absent
16 Shelburne:	Yes	So. Burlington:	Yes (2)	Underhill:	Yes
17 Westford:	Absent	Williston:	Yes	Winooski:	Yes
18 VTrans:	Yes				

19  
 20 MOTION CARRIED WITH 21 OF 24 VOTES AND 15 OF 18 MUNICIPALITIES VOTING IN THE  
 21 AFFIRMATIVE.

22  
 23 7. VPSP2 Equity Screen for Regionally Driven Transportation Projects

24 Eleni referred members to the memo included in the packet. She reminded everyone this is an  
 25 informational memo, and this process (VPSP2 Equity Screening) is still in draft form and at the very  
 26 early stages of development. She introduced Christine Forde who has been working on the VPSP2  
 27 process with VTrans over the last few years. Christine explained the actual project scores will be  
 28 looked at next month once received from VTrans. She also explained that the scores reviewed by  
 29 the Board in April were derived using qualification sheets and they will be slightly different than the  
 30 VTrans scores since they are using a more detailed workbook. She stated that we want to develop  
 31 and employ a functional Equity Screening to include in the VPSP2 process.

32  
 33 Eleni reiterated that this is an initial effort to develop an Equity Screening and the methodology will  
 34 change as we refine the process. She also said that the CCRPC will be working with VTrans and other  
 35 RPCs in the next 6 to 8 months to develop an Equity Screening framework that can be used  
 36 statewide. For this initial screening, CCRPC staff utilized the ECOS Map viewer to understand some  
 37 of the populations living near or access the project area. The data included:

- 38
- 39 • Race (currently categorized as % non-white; there is a need for disaggregated data)
- 40 • % of population linguistically isolated
- 41 • % of population with income below Federal poverty level
- 42 • Subsidized housing as well as type of housing (single, multifamily, group quarters,  
 43 mobile home)
- 44 • Opportunity index, which includes data on poverty rate, school proficiency,  
 45 homeownership rate, unemployment, and job access.
- 46 • We considered our personal knowledge and experience of the project area, facilities,  
 47 outreach during the scoping study, etc.

1  
2 With this information, we applied an impacts-benefit based approach to assign a general equity  
3 methodology as used by the NJ Transportation Planning Authority.  
4

- 5 • Higher positive ranking: Address safety problems, results in reduced noise, air or pollutant  
6 impacts, mitigates community cohesion or other social impacts; mitigates cumulative  
7 impacts, or improves accessibility to employment, education, healthcare, and other  
8 essential services for Environmental Justice (EJ) communities.
- 9 • Medium positive ranking: Add/improve vehicle, bicycle, transit, or pedestrian connectivity  
10 within EJ communities.
- 11 • Lower ranking: Repair roadways or bridges, or streetscapes unless project would result in  
12 permanent negative impacts to traffic conditions in the neighborhood (e.g., by bringing in  
13 more vehicle traffic) or would involve significant right-of-way acquisition in EJ communities.  
14

15 Some projects would be considered “neutral” if they do not appear to have a positive or negative  
16 impact on EJ communities. We did not rate any projects as negative using this approach.  
17

18 We are looking for the Board’s feedback on the Equity Screening Process we used and ways we can  
19 improve it.  
20

21 Garret Mott said he feels there is a disconnect between the rankings, since the higher positive is  
22 addressing safety, and the lower ranking is addressing roadway and bridge repairs. Shouldn’t safety  
23 be correlated with bridge and roadways? Eleni said safety and asset management (maintenance for  
24 bridges, roadways, other assets) is included in the VPSP2 process already as separate categories and  
25 are not being ignored. The equity screening is looking specifically at degrees of benefits (safety and  
26 others) for underrepresented populations.  
27

28 Jim Donovan asked what the relationship between the higher positive ranking and the medium  
29 positive ranking is since they are measuring different areas. Eleni explained these categories provide  
30 room for judgement and she offered to speak more about these initial rankings outside of the  
31 meeting with any members who are interested. She also reiterated this process is only at the  
32 beginning stages and there is still a lot of work to be done.  
33

34 John Zicconi said he had similar questions as Garret and Jim, but he is also concerned if the equity  
35 piece has a separate ranking, having scores set up this way has potential to create negative public  
36 relations. He feels we need to be careful about how this is set up. Eleni said, the overall goal is to  
37 have equity incorporated into the VPSP2 process, because currently, there is no equity category, and  
38 at this stage we simply want to make sure we address equity in some way. Charlie said we are still at  
39 the very beginning stages of this work and there are many details to consider as the process moves  
40 forward. We will continue working until there is clarity.  
41

42 Bard shared the phrase “Do you want it done right, or do you want it done right now”?  
43

#### 44 8. Chair/Executive Director Report

- 45 a) Equity Leadership Team Charlie said the second meeting was held yesterday. He explained  
46 there was a reading assignment given and the material will be shared with the Board. Future  
47 Equity Leadership Team meetings will include minutes that will be include with the Board  
48 packets. Charlie explained the goal is to work to improve equity within our communities. We

1 do not want to increase inequity or do something that is harmful. Mike reminded everyone we  
2 will coordinate and share the information with our municipalities. RPC staff will reach out to  
3 each of the towns, likely in July.  
4

5 b) I-89 Study Update Charlie explained the project advisory met today and there were five  
6 bundles: 1)No Build, 2)TDM Investments to decrease demand for driving, 3)Package of TDM  
7 investments plus Exit 14, 4)TDM, Exit 14 and Exit 13 and 5)TDM, Exit 14 and 12B There was  
8 unanimous support for first four, but a close vote to keep 12B in the analysis. This will be  
9 helpful information. Charlie said there were concerns from community members about the  
10 budget for this project and more analysis is necessary to ensure the project is done correctly.  
11

12 c) CWSP Update – Rule and Start-up

13 Charlie was hoping the rule would be finalized but it is not. He expects it will be within the next  
14 two weeks. Funding should also be finalized within the next couple of weeks.  
15

16 d) Legislative Update

17 Charlie said funds need to be shifted around based on federal rules and guidance of how ARPA  
18 (American Rescue Plan Act) funds can be spent. Act 250 discussions will move into next year.

19 The Bylaw Modernization bill, to create an incentive for towns to update bylaws to create more  
20 affordable housing, is moving forward. There will be funding to help towns update their bylaws.

21 The Project Based Tax Incremental Funding (TIF) bill will not move forward. Charlie asked Sharon  
22 for her thoughts, and she agreed, the project is not happening this year. Charlie explained he is  
23 not sure if the Rental Registry Bill will move forward. Charlie said, with the ARPA funding, there  
24 is a lot of support in Legislature for RPC's. Each commission is likely to receive \$7500. There may  
25 also be money added to Brownfields, approximately \$100,000. -  
26

27 9. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Mike noted that minutes for our committees were included  
28 as links as well as documents within the packet (Executive/Finance Committee, TAC, PAC, MS4 Sub-  
29 Committee and CWAC).  
30

31 10. Future Agenda Topics. Charlie reminded members our annual meeting is held in June. We will hold  
32 the election of officers and warn public hearing for the TIP. We will continue to provide updates on  
33 the status of the VPSP2 process. We also have an opportunity to offer comments on the VELCO  
34 plan. Charlie asked if anyone wants to submit comments to VELCO? Jim asked, if we are supposed  
35 to be reviewing projects, what does the RPC have to do differently about site review; we were  
36 presented with two plans that have not been effectively coordinated at this time. Charlie said we  
37 will follow this up with a memo.  
38

39 11. Members' Items, Other business. Jim asked when terms for commissioners begin and expire?  
40 Charlie explained the term lasts for two years and run from July through June. Emma sends letters  
41 regarding the commissioner terms out to towns every April.  
42

43 12. Adjournment. JEFF MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO ADJOURN THE BOARD  
44 MEETING AT 7:37 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
45

46 Respectfully submitted,  
47 Amy Irvin Witham  
48